DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 640 AC 012 787

AUTHOR	Campbell, Charles; And Others
TITLE	A Study of Extension Program Planning as Perceived by Off-Campus Faculty, Lay Leaders and the General Public in the Show-Me Area.
INSTITUTION	Missouri Univ., St. Louis. Extension Div.
PUB DATE	May 71
NOTE	26p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; Data Collection; *Extension Agents; *Extension Education; Home Economics; *Instructional Staff; Nonprofessional Personnel; Program Development; *Program Planning; Research Reviews (Publications); *Staff Improvement

ABSTRACT

In 1971, the Show-Me Extension Program Planning Unit of the University of Missouri Extension Division was selected for study as an area of program planning. The study was designed to gather information about extension personnel, extension leaders, and the general public in order to help strengthen programs in the area and in the state. Data were collected, by interview, in response to five research questions. The results indicated that (1) the Show-Me faculty primarily used clientele in planning specific events; (2) extension Councils did not play a major role in program development; (3) coordination and linkage within program areas was good, but that between program areas could be strengthened by more administrative attention; (4) almost 60% of the population was aware of extension programs such as Home Economics, Agriculture, and 4-H Programs, but only 28% were program participants; (5) all three respondent groups identified community-public problems as the most prevalent; (6) there were no area-wide program development committees; the faculty used individual client consultation; and (7) the change to staff specialization on a multicounty basis has made program development more difficult for extension faculty; lay leaders felt that this specialization provided broader program offerings and a better trained staff, although they were concerned about the loss of personal contact. (Author/JS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 066640

A STUDY OF EXTENSION PROGRAM PLANNING AS PERCEIVED BY OFF-CAMPUS FACULTY, LAY LEADERS AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC IN THE SHOW-ME AREA

Prepared

By

Charles Campbell
Larry Hale
B. W. Harrison

May, 1971

AC 012 787

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	2
Purpose of the Investigation	3
Procedures	3
Findings	
Research Question # 1	4
Research Question # 2	6
Research Question # 3	8
Research Question # 4	12
Research Question # 5	14
Summary	15
Appendix 1	17
Appendix 2	21
Appendix 3	23

INTRODUCTION

Program Planning for the University of Missouri Extension Division is a continuous and cooperative process involving clientele and Extension personnel at various levels. This involvement of clientele and Extension personnel results in (1) identification of problems, (2) establishment of objectives, (3) development of plans, (4) conduct of activities to reach established objectives and (5) collection of evidence to evaluate progress toward the objectives previously established.

Consultants for University Extension are charged with the responsibility to study Extension programs and provide relevant information and advice to the total Extension staff on:

a. The mission of Extension.

b. Overall program balance and linkage.

c. Program effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness.

d. Procedures used in program planning, execution and evaluation.

In early 1971, the Show-Me Extension Program Planning Unit was selected as an area for study of program planning. Consultants working as a task force designed the study to gather information from Extension personnel, Extension leaders, and the general public to help strengthen programs in the area and the state.

Consultants wish to express their gratitude to Wayne Atkins, Mary Nell Greenwood, Fred J. Culver, Amos Snider, Hugh Keith, Paul Burgess, Marcus Holman, Gail King, William Knight and Joel Hartman for assisting with the interviewing. Special gratitude is extended to Marion Gentry, Show-Me Area Extension Director and to the faculty, leaders and others who participated in the study.

PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION

The purpose of this investigation was to gather information about the Extension program planning processes used in the Show-Me Extension Area. Also, an attempt was made to determine if the move to specialization of staff has affected Extension programs in the area, if there are problem areas where Extension should devote more attention than currently is being devoted, and the extent to which people in the area are aware of and involved in Extension programs.

Specifically, answers were sought to the following research questions:

1. What program planning procedures are being used by Show-Me Area Extension faculty?
2. To what extent are people aware of and involved in Extension programs in the Show-Me Area?
3. Is there a positive relationship between major problems identified by faculty, Extension lay leaders and the general public; and further, are problems identified receiving emphasis in the present program?
4. In what ways are people in the Show-Me Extension Area involved in planning the Extension programs conducted in the area?
5. In what ways has the change to specialization of staff affected programs or program planning in the Show-Me Extension Area?

PROCEDURES

To collect information dealing with the five questions raised above, three interview schedules were constructed; one for Extension faculty, one for Extension leaders and one for the general public. (See Appendix 1, 2 and 3).

The faculty interview schedule was administered to all Extension faculty working in the Show-Me Area. The Extension leader interview schedule was administered to forty-eight leaders selected in the following manner:

1. Each faculty member was asked to submit the names of 30 people they had involved in development of their Extension programs.
2. The names were then stratified by program areas and counties, and a random sample of eight names selected from each of the six program areas.
3. The selected sample of leaders were then interviewed with assistance from Area Extension Directors from surrounding areas.

Prior to the interview with selected Extension leaders, the Area Director wrote to each of them indicating they would be contacted by someone from the University and the study was briefly described.

The general public component of the study consisted of a random sample of thirty-two households in the Show-Me Area selected and interviewed to determine their knowledge of Extension programs in the area.

Following completion of the interviews, the comments were tabulated question by question and a data bank of information was compiled for use in reporting the findings of the study. This complete bank of information is available in the offices of the Consultants.

FINDINGS

RESEARCH QUESTION # 1

"What program planning procedures are being used by Show-Me Area Extension faculty?"

A. Program Planning Process.

Most faculty member responses indicated that they use a variety of planning processes. The three basic processes which were mentioned most often were:

1. Contact is made with individuals to determine their interests. If several mention the same or closely related interests, then representative individuals are brought together to plan and promote the resulting activity or course.
2. Programs are largely planned by the faculty member after consulting with local people, agency representatives, and other University personnel.
3. Planning is carried out by local committees. They go through the process of deciding needs and then plan programs to help people reach these needs. The faculty member helps facilitate this process.

B. Program Evaluation.

Very little evidence was found to indicate that criteria are developed in written form as a part of their evaluative methods.

Most of the responses indicated the evaluation of activities and not the evaluation of the degree of change in the behavior of the clients. The four evaluation techniques most frequently mentioned were:

1. Questionnaire at the end of an educational event.

2. Committee meeting as a follow-up to an activity to discuss its value.

3. Personal contact - ask people what they think about a specific program and what results are being obtained.

4. Observe what people are doing.

Two faculty members did indicate the use of major thorough and more formal evaluation techniques to determine the behavioral changes.

C. Use of Guidelines and Information from Project Leaders and Program Directors.

All but two (2) area faculty members indicated that they were using the guidelines and information. The guidelines and information are used in a general way to help determine program priorities and to help explain programs to new groups.

Also, individual state faculty members were frequently mentioned in addition to the project leaders and program directors as providing relevant program planning guidelines and information.

D. Coordination and Linkage.

The responses indicate that there is coordination and linkage within and between program categories. Most of the faculty members expressed that they involve other area faculty members in their programs and that other faculty members involve them.

The leadership for this linkage and coordination has come from the area subject matter faculty and has not developed from the area-wide total faculty conferences. For example: when asked if program determination and coordination is accomplished in area faculty conferences, the response was NO. The overall area faculty conferences communicate administrative decision. However, area program category meetings are held and coordination and linkage does occur at this level.

E. Extension Council's Role.

The responses indicated that Extension Councils do not represent all the program categories. They are primarily agriculturally oriented and do not comprehend the objectives of the non-traditional programs. It was indicated that the Pettis County Council comes the closest to being a representative group. Lafayette County Council was mentioned as the most agriculturally oriented group and least representative of all the program categories. However, the councils are not contributing very much to program planning in any of the program categories.

The councils were perceived as carrying out roles in programs. Those roles most mentioned were:

1. Individual council members serve on special interest committees.

2. Legitimizer for programs.

While there was some evidence that councils are giving program support, a majority of the responses indicated that the council are not very supportive. This is especially true of all the non-traditional programs except Expanded Foods and Nutrition.

Two of the area faculty members indicated that they had not been involved with councils. One has never attended a Show-Me Council meeting and the other one attended one meeting but was not on the program.

The Extension councils were not perceived as the overall planning committee.

F. MEMIS and Program Planning.

The following quote would best describe the majority of the responses received:

> "Program planning is separate and apart from MEMIS in that one determines what his program will be and then fits his program to MEMIS for reporting purposes."

G. Extension's Effectiveness in Programming.

When asked what should be done to improve Extension's effectiveness in programming, the following area faculty member responses were most frequently received:

Response	Number
Improve staff morale	10
Public relations	7
Involvement of people and be responsive to their concerns and needs	12

RESEARCH QUESTION # 2

"To what extent are people aware of and involved in Extension programs in the Show-Me Area?"

Questions 1, 2 and 3 of the general public interview schedule were designed to secure information to answer this research question.

Examination of the data contained in Table I indicates that 19 of the 32 people interviewed (almost 60%) indicated they were aware of programs conducted by University of Missouri Extension. 15 people indicated they knew participants in the programs, and 9 of the 32 (over 1/4) indicated they had participated or were now participating in programs conducted by University of Missouri Extension.

TABLE I

AWARENESS OR INVOLVEMENT OF PEOPLE IN
EXTENSION PROGRAMS IN THE SHOW-ME AREA

(N=32)

Response	Number	Percent
Aware of programs	19	59.4
Know participants in programs	15	46.9
Participate or have participated in programs	9	28.1

Respondents were also asked to identify the Extension programs of which they were aware, knew people who participated in, or were participants themselves. Responses to these questions are tabulated and presented in Table II. Since many of the respondents were aware of more than one program, the number of responses is greater than the number of individuals. The traditional program areas of Extension (Agriculture, Home Economics and 4-H) accounted for a large share of the programs identified by respondents. For example, examination of the data in column 1 of Table II would indicate that the traditional program areas accounted for almost 84% of the programs of which people were aware.

TABLE II

EXTENSION PROGRAMS WITH WHICH PEOPLE IN THE
SHOW-ME AREA INDICATED AWARENESS OR INVOLVEMENT

	Aware of Programs	Know Participants in Programs	Participate in Programs
Agriculture	13	12	6
Home Economics	10	8	2
4-H	8	7	3
Youth	2	2	1
Extension Council	2	1	0
Quality of Environment	1	0	0
Community Development	1	0	1
Cannot Remember	0	3	0
TOTAL	37	33	13

RESEARCH QUESTION # 3

"Is there a positive relationship between major problems identified by faculty, Extension lay leaders and the general public; and further, are problems identified receiving emphasis in the present program?"

Lay leaders, Extension faculty and the general public were asked to identify three problems which they felt were a major concern for people in the area. Responses to this question were examined and categorized into the major program areas by which Extension work is structured. Responses which did not relate to a specific program are listed in a category labeled general. The tabulation of responses is shown in Table III.

Examination of the data shown in Table III reveals some differences in responses from the three groups of people interviewed. Lay leaders and the general public identified more problems in the Food & Fiber program area than did the Extension faculty. Also, in the Youth category, the lay leaders and general public referred to problems with alcohol, drugs, and to irresponsibility of youth numerous times, while the faculty did not identify any problems in this area.

In the Community-Public Sector, the greatest difference in problems identified occurs between the sample of lay leaders and the sample of the general public. The general public identified about 40% more problems categorized in this area than did the Extension lay leaders.

The Extension faculty was more prone to identify problems in the area of Continuing Education than were either the lay leaders or the general public.

The lay leaders identified a greater percentage of problems in Quality of Environment than did either the Extension faculty or the general public. The same is also true for the program area of Business, Industry & Labor, as Extension lay leaders identified a higher percentage of problems in this area than did either the faculty or general public.

TABLE III

A COMPARISON OF MAJOR PROBLEMS
IDENTIFIED BY LAY LEADERS,
EXTENSION FACULTY AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Problem Category	Lay Leader Responses (N=142)		Extension Faculty Responses (N=56)		General Public Responses (N=84)	
General	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Low income, welfare, and discrimination	9		11		9	
High prices - inflation	2		0		4	
Lack of leadership and cooperation with Extension	12		0		0	
SUB TOTAL	23	16	11	20	13	15

TABLE III (Cont'd.)

Problem Category	Lay Leader Responses (N=142)		Extension Faculty Responses (N=56)		General Public Responses (N=84)	
Business, Industry & Labor	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Lack of loyal and competent employees	6		1		0	
Lack of local businesses to provide services	4		0		0	
Inability of local business and industry to compete	2		3		1	
Financial problems (recession and credit)	2		0		4	
Need help in management	2		0		0	
SUB TOTAL	16	11	4	7	5	6
Community-Public						
Need increased and improved job opportunities	16		4		16	
Lack of and high cost of doctors and medical facilities	4		2		2	
Need improvement in recreation and other public services	5		6		16	
Local government needs improvement (planning and zoning, financing, townships)	20		7		8	
Lack of adequate housing	4		0		2	
Need better community leadership and cooperation	7		7		1	
The Vietnam War	0		2		2	
SUB TOTAL	56	39	28	50	47	56
Continuing Education						
Need more vocational training	5		2		2	
People do not recognize their educational needs	3		2		0	
Remoteness from centers of education	0		1		0	
SUB TOTAL	8	6	5	9	2	2
Home Economics						
Breakdown of family life	3		2		3	
Consumers need more information	1		0		0	
Over-population	1		0		0	
SUB TOTAL	5	4	2	4	3	4

TABLE III (Cont'd.)

Problem Category	Lay Leader Responses (N=142)		Extension Faculty Responses (N=56)		General Public Responses (N=84)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Youth						
Use of alcohol and drugs by school-age youth	5		0		0	
Irresponsibility of youth and lack of leadership	3		0		3	
SUB TOTAL	8	6	0	0	3	4
Food & Fiber						
Low farm income	8		2		4	
It is way too dry	0		0		4	
Preservation of prime agricultural areas	3		0		0	
Farmers do not understand management	2		1		1	
SUB TOTAL	13	9	3	5	9	11
Quality of Environment						
Dumping of trash along roads	3		0		0	
Pollution of the environment	10		3		2	
SUB TOTAL	13	9	3	5	2	2

Lay leaders and the general public in the Show-Me Area were asked to identify which Extension programs had been most helpful to people in the area, and the way in which they had been of help. Lay leaders identified the Food & Fiber programs most often as those which had been of most help. Youth and 4-H programs were next most frequently mentioned, followed by programs dealing with home economics.

The general public identified 4-H most often, and Food & Fiber and Home Economics an equal number of times as programs which had been most helpful to people in their area.

New programs with which the Extension leaders and general public were most familiar and favorable toward were: (1) Expanded Food and Nutrition, (2) career programs with youth, (3) business and industrial short courses, and (4) the environmental health program in the area, especially that part dealing with the reclamation of strip-mined land.

Table IV is presented so a comparison can be made of the percentage of problems identified by lay leaders, faculty and the general public; and the staffing pattern and percentage of time spent in the various program areas.

The most striking variations occur in the program areas of Community-Public, Family & Youth and Food & Fiber. The percentage of problems identified in the Community-Public area are much higher than the percent of staff assigned to that area and the amount of time reported working in that program area. The reverse is true in the program areas of Family & Youth and Food & Fiber, where a relatively small percentage of the problems identified were in this category, but a sizeable portion of the staff and work time were reported in these program areas.

TABLE IV

A COMPARISON OF PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED, FACULTY POSITIONS, AND TIME REPORTED BY PROGRAM AREA

Program Area	Problems Identified By Lay Leaders %	Problems Identified By Faculty %	Problems Identified By General Public %	No. of Extension Positions F.T.E.	% of Faculty	% Time Reported 1970 MEMIS(1)
Administration and General	16	20	15	1.0	5.5	6.0
Business, Industry and Labor	11	7	6	0.6	3.3	2.0
Community-Public	39	50	56	1.0	5.5	12.0
Continuing Education	6	9	2	2.0	11.0	1.0
Family & Youth	10	4	8	8.25	45.5(2)	51.0
Food & Fiber	9	5	11	5.0	27.5(2)	28.0
Quality of Environment	9	5	2	.30	1.7	0 (3)

(1) Time reported in first 6 months of Fiscal Year '71 (7-1-70 to 12-31-70).

(2) Adjustments were made for staff vacancies which existed.

(3) Quality of environment was not identified in Fiscal Year '71 reports.

RESEARCH QUESTION # 4

"In what ways are people in the Show-Me Area involved in planning the Extension Programs conducted in the area."

Two questions on the faculty interview schedule pertained to this research question and two on the lay leaders interview schedule. Each of the four questions will be treated individually in this report.

Faculty questions were:

(1) How do you involve clientele in program planning?

Method	Number	Percent
Individual consultation	16	43
Special interest committees	11	30
Advisory committee	3	8
Legitimizer	3	8
Home Economics Club Council	2	5
4-H Club Council	1	3
Evaluation Committee	1	3
TOTAL	37	

No evidence was obtained indicating that faculty were using area-wide program development committees.

(2) What characteristics are important in people you involve in program planning?

A wide range of characteristics were mentioned, however, the three major ones were - (a) direct interest, (b) leadership and (c) knowledgeable.

Characteristics	Number	Percent
Direct interest	22	25
Knowledgeable and objective	12	14
Leadership ability	10	12
Willingness to serve - including time	7	8
Interested in other people	7	8
Ability to represent clientele's interest	5	6
Position held	3	3
Geographic representation	3	3
Broad minded	3	3
Enthusiasm	3	3

Characteristics	Number	Percent
Innovator	3	3
Age consideration	2	2
Cooperativeness	2	2
Ability to express themselves	2	2
Civic minded	1	1
Optimistic	1	1
Successful financially	1	1
Friendliness	1	1
Empathy	1	1
Adaptability	1	1
TOTAL	90	

Some faculty members considered it important to secure from other faculty members names of leaders to involve. New staff members relied heavily on this approach.

Lay leaders responses:

(1) How are you involved in helping to determine the Extension programs?

Method	Number	Percent
Planning committee	17	34
Extension Council member	6	12
Short Course planning	4	8
Consultant	4	8
Refer people to Extension office	2	4
Advisory Committee	1	2
No assistance	16	32
TOTAL	50	

Faculty suggested lay leaders who they identified as helping with program determination, however, sixteen leaders interviewed indicated they did not help.

(2) Do you think other people in your area feel they have influence in helping determine what Extension programs will be?

Response	Number	Percent
Influence	19	35
Little influence	17	31
No influence	14	25

Response	Number	Percent
Don't know	5	9
TOTAL	55	

Some responses specifically mention variations between programs, thus accounting for more than forty-eight responses.

RESEARCH QUESTION # 5

"In what ways has the change to specialization of staff affected programs or program planning in the Show-Me Extension Area?"

Faculty question:

What are your major problems in programming on a multi-county basis?

No attempt was made to list problems in order of significance or number of times mentioned by faculty. Problems, however, fall into these broad categories:

1. Distance and time - for both agents and leaders to travel to do planning.
2. Multi-county assignment and specialization of staff makes program coordination more difficult.
3. All staff members and lay leaders have not accepted the area concept, thereby slowing down program planning efforts.
4. Staff morale and agent turnover is affecting program planning efforts.
5. Harder to get acquainted with key leaders on an area basis.
6. Some programs are still county oriented, especially youth programs.
7. It is more difficult to get news media to cooperate on an area basis.
8. Harder to secure cooperation with other agencies since most of them are still operating on a county basis.

Two points staff made indirectly related to program development were: (a) people do not know staff members intimately outside their headquarters county and they do not know about program availability and (b) some staff members recognized the need for area-wide long-range planning.

Lay leader responses:

What effect has specialization of staff had on Extension programs in your area?

Leaders had some concerns about the present staffing arrangements, however, they were satisfied with some of the apparent advantages.

Advantages to specialization as viewed by leaders included:

1. Faculty specialist have been more help to selected clientele.
2. It makes possible better team efforts on some programs.
3. Programs are reaching more urban people.
4. A broader program offering has resulted from staff specialization.
5. It permits staff member to work on programs in line with his training and interests.
6. More professionalism is evident through a better trained staff.

Some present concerns of lay leaders are:

1. Faculty members are not as readily accessible.
2. Less personal contacts are being made by faculty.
3. It will take time for the change to specialization of staff to be accepted.
4. The geographic assignment of some faculty members is too large.
5. Faculty spends too much time in traveling.
6. There is rivalry between counties for staff time.
7. It might be more difficult to secure local finances.

SUMMARY

In describing program planning efforts, Show-Me faculty indicated they used clientele primarily in planning specific events. The faculty did not perceive Extension Councils as playing a major role in program development. Coordination and linkage within program areas appeared to be good, but the coordination and linkage between program areas could be strengthened by more administrative attention. Most of the efforts in program evaluation were directed to securing an informal reaction to the value of a specific event, and there was little evidence of planned evaluation of the effectiveness of programs. Guidelines and information from project leaders, program directors and state specialists were helpful.

Almost 60% of a sample of people from households in the Show-Me Area were aware of Extension programs. However, only 28% indicated they participated in the programs. Over 80% of the responses identified programs in Home Economics, Agriculture and 4-H as programs with which they were familiar or involved.

When asked to identify problems of major concern to the area, the sample of lay leaders and general public identified problems in Food & Fiber and Family & Youth about twice as frequently as did the faculty. All three groups of respondents

identified problems of a community-public nature far more often than other types of problems. Almost 50% of all the problems identified were classified in the Community-Public Sector, contrasted with 7% of the Extension faculty and 12% of the faculty time reported in that program category.

The Show-Me faculty indicated they involved clientele in program planning through individual consultations and use of special interest committees. No evidence was found of area-wide program development committees. Even though the names of lay leaders were selected from lists of people the faculty indicated they had involved in programs, 32% of the responses indicated they had given no assistance in program development. Only 36% of the lay leader responses indicated they felt people could influence the determination of Extension programs.

The change to specialization of staff on a multi-county basis has made program development more difficult for Extension faculty because of time and distance involved, lack of acceptance of the area concept, difficulty in getting acquainted with people over a larger area and difficulty in cooperating with news media and other agencies. Lay leaders felt specialization of staff and multi-county assignment had provided broader program offerings and a better trained staff. They were concerned about the loss of personal contact and accessibility of faculty, the travel time involved and rivalry between counties. The above may lead to greater difficulty in securing local finances.

Area _____

Faculty Member _____

Date _____

Interviewer _____

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Briefly describe what you are trying to accomplish through your educational program.

2. What program planning process seems to be the most productive for you? Describe.

3. How do you involve the clientele in program planning?

4. Give examples of program evaluation that you have used.

5. What characteristics are important in people you involve in program planning?

6. Do you use guidelines and information from project leaders and program directors in program planning? If yes, how?

7. What other area faculty members do you involve in your planning efforts? How?

8. What other area faculty members involve you in their planning efforts? How?

9. How do you perceive the Extension Council's role as it relates to your program?

10. Describe or give examples of coordination and linkage between your program and programs of other area faculty members.

11. Is program determination and coordination accomplished in area faculty conferences? If so, give an example.

12. Describe how you relate your program planning process to MEMIS.

13. What are the three major problems that people have in your area?

14. What are your major problems in programming on a multi-county basis?

15. What should be done to improve Extension's effectiveness in programming?

Area _____

Date _____

Interviewer _____

Key No. _____

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR LAY PEOPLE

1. What _____ Extension Programs have been most helpful to people you know? Why?

2. Give examples of how people have been helped by the Extension program.

3. How are you involved in helping determine the Extension program in _____.

4. Do you think other people in your area feel they have influence in helping determine what the Extension Program will be?

5. What are the three major problems that people have in your area?

6. Do you think University of Missouri Extension can and should help solve any of these problems?

   If yes, which ones?

7. What effect has specialization of staff had on Extension Programs in your area?

8. How would you suggest Extension Programs be improved?

Area _____

Date _____

Interviewer _____

Key No. _____

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SAMPLE OF GENERAL PUBLIC

Biographical Data:

a. Occupation _____

b. Sex _____

c. Age (estimated) Check one: Under 30 _____
30-50 _____
Over 50 _____

d. Income (estimated) Check one: Below average _____
Average _____
Above average _____

e. Residence Check one: Rural _____
Urban _____
Suburban _____

1. Are you aware of any educational programs which are conducted by University of Missouri Extension?

If yes, which ones?

If no, proceed to Question 5.

2. Do you know people who participate in any of these Extension educational programs?

   If yes, which programs?

   If no, proceed to Question 5.

3. Are you now participating or have you participated in any of the Extension educational programs?

   If yes, which programs and when?

   If no, proceed to Question 4, Others.

4. Give examples of how you or others you know have benefited from Extension educational programs.

   You:

   Others:

5. What are the three major problems which face people in your area?

(1)

(2)

(3)

6. Do you think University of Missouri Extension can and should help solve any of these problems?

If yes, which ones?

ERIC Clearinghouse
AUG 2 8 1972
on Adult Education